

Applicant: Christopher R. Hammond et al.

Group Art Unit: 2125 Serial Number: 09/531,818

Examiner: Jarrett, Ryan A. Filed: March 21, 2000

For: PROCESS PLANNING FOR

DISTRIBUTED MANUFACTURING

AND REPAIR

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL TO THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Express Mail mailing label number: EV 593382881 US

Date of Mailing: June 16, 2005

I certify that the documents listed below:

- Certificate of Express Mailing (1 pg.)
- Issue Fee Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate)
- Six Sheets of Replacement Drawings (6 pgs)
- Comments on Statements of Reasons for Allowance (2 pgs.)
- Return Post Card

are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.10 on the date indicated above in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: ISSUE FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Robert B. Ree

Reg. Nd. 45,548

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600

St. Louis, MO 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070

13DV13576 PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Christopher R. Hammond, et al.

Art Unit: 2125

Serial No.: 09/531,818

Examiner: Ryan A. Jarrett

Filed: March 21, 2000

:

For: PROCESS PLANNING FOR

DISTRIBUTED MANUFACTURING AND

REPAIR

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313

Sir:

The following comments are in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowability dated April 15, 2005.

Applicants believe that the Statement of Reasons for Allowance in this case is improper as it merely copies portions of each limitation of the independent claim into the reasons for allowance. While Applicants believe that the claims are allowable, Applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Also, reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear the Examiner's reasons for allowing a claim or claims (see 37 CFR §1.104(e)). In the present case, Applicants believe the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, Applicants do not necessarily agree with each

13DV13576 PATENT

statement in the reasons for allowance and do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the teachings of the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Reese 111 Registration No. 45,548

ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600 St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740

(314) 621-5070